OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE

U. S. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE HILO, HAWAII

DOCKET NO.

IN THE MATTER OF:

WILDERNESS PROPOSAL,

HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK

PLACE:

Hilo, Hawaii

DATE:

February 20, 1974

PAGES:

1-63

BILL'S RECORDING SERVICE

Court Reporters

Failing Building Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 223-7627 2462 Kuhio Avenue Honolulu, Hawaii 96815 (808) 923-7557

1 BEFORE THE 2 U. S. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 3 HILO, HAWAII 4 5 In the Matter of: 6 WILDERNESS PROPOSAL, 7 HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK 8 9 Aloha Room, 10 Hilo Lagoon, Hilo, Hawaii; 11 Wednesday, February 20, 1974 12 Pursuant to notice, the above-entitled matter came on for 13 hearing at 1:00 o'clock p.m., 14 BEFORE: 15 JOHN DAVIS, Hearing Officer. 16 ALSO PRESENT: 17 HCWARD CHAPMAN, Regional Director of the Western Region, 18 National Park Service. BRIAN HARRY, Superintendent, Hawaii Volcanoes National 19 20 Park. 21 22 23 24 25

<u>I N D E X</u>

2	WITNESS	PAGE
3	Brian Harry	7
4	James J. Dorsey	13
5	Barry Bodhaine	14
6	Helen S. Baldwin	21
7	Alma K. Cooper	24
8	Quentin Tomich	42
9	James Pedersen	45
10	Alfred Tong	47
11	Mae E. Mull	56
12	William P. Mull	60
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	•	
25		

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Good afternoon, ladies and gentle-

The hearing will please come to order.

4

3

Today, we are going to talk about the management of a precious resource, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. This land,

6

5

comprising some 223,344 acres, is truly one of America's unique

7

National Parks.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

My name is John Davis and I have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, to act as Presiding Officer at this hearing, which is being held pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-577, 88th Congress, approved September 3rd, 1964.

This morning, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to introduce the Regional Director of the Western Region of the National Park Service, Mr. Howard Chapman.

I would also like to introduce the Superintendent of the Park, Mr. Brian Harry.

And I will also introduce our Reporter, Mr. Bill Chun, who is sitting to my left over here.

This hearing has been called for the purpose of receiving comments and views as to the appropriateness of the proposal for the establishment of wilderness in Hawaii Volcanoes Nationa Park. Any such comments and views presented here, as well as any other statement and exhibits sent to me by March 20th, will become a part of the official record. These materials will be

accorded careful consideration and will become a part of the report of review made to the Secretary of the Interior.

In order to fully inform everyone present of the nature and purpose of the hearing, it might be well to review briefly the series of events which have led to it:

The Wilderness Act set out certain procedures for the establishment of wilderness areas to be included in the National Wilderness Preservation System. These procedures assure that, in every such review, there will be full consideration of the proposals by the public, the Department which administers the area, the President and Congress. Implicit in the Act is the recognition that wilderness is a public resource and that therefore, the public should have a voice in evaluating proposals to establish and preserve that resource.

Notice to establish wilderness areas in Hawaii Volcanoes

National Park was published in the Federal Register of October

26th, 1973; and in a number of newspapers which have general

circulation in the vicinity of the Park. A copy of the notice

and the affidavit of newspaper publications will be made a part

of the hearing record.

I would like now to offer some explanation about the order and procedure we will follow. This hearing is not a debate or trial and there will be no cross-examination of persons who present oral or written statements. If any person has a question, germane to the Wilderness Proposal under consideration,

this should be directed to me as Hearing Officer, and the questioner should identify himself and the organization he represents. If, in my opinion, the question is pertinent to the matter under consideration, I will either attempt to answer it or direct the question to someone better able to provide the answer.

All who have given advance notice of the intention to present oral statements will have the opportunity to do so and may present any other written materials, which relate to the matter contained in the Notice of Public Hearing, for consideration by the Secretary of the Interior. Others who failed to give advance notification, as the hearing notice required, will have an opportunity to be heard if there is time remaining after the other oral presentations, and may register with the Park Service Representative, seated at the table over there next to the entryway.

Of course, anyone may submit written statements for the official record, which will be held open for that purpose for 30 days after conclusion of this hearing. Materials submitted after the close of this hearing should be mailed to me, the Hearing Officer, in care of the Superintendent, whose address is, "Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Hawaii, zipcode 96718".

The proceedings of this hearing are being recorded and a transcript of the hearing record will be available in about 10 days and may then be reviewed at the office of the Superinten-

dent, the office of the Hawaii State Director of the National Park Service, at 677 Ala Moana Boulevard, Honolulu; the Regional Director of the National Park Service — the office of the Regional Director of the National Park Service at 450 Golden Gate Avenue in San Francisco, as well as in Room 1013 of the Department of the Interior Building in Washington, D.C.

Anyone who desires a copy should make arrangements with the Reporter to obtain one. There will be a charge for them and orders will be accepted until March 15th.

Persons who present oral statements for the hearing record should do so from this podium and should speak into the microphone provided here and please, speak slowly and distinctly, so that the Reporter will be able to record the complete statement. All of this may seem a little technical or strict, but it is necessary for the conduct of an orderly hearing and I am sure you are as interested as I am in having a complete statement of views for such an evaluation of the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park Wilderness Proposal. Also, it will assure that everyone is given a fair and reasonable opportunity to be heard.

To begin with, we will have a presentation of the proposal to establish wilderness in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park by Superintendent Brian Harry, who is representing the Regional Director of the Western Region of the National Park Service, with Headquarters in San Francisco.

After that, we will follow generally the order of presenta-

tion given in the official notice of the hearing.

Superintendent Harry?

PRESENTATION BY MR. BRIAN HARRY

MR. HARRY: Thank you. I would like to take just a few moments to explain roughly the proposal that we have. This proposal is to establish by Act of Congress, wilderness areas within our existing boundary of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. As many of you in the room know, who hike the Park trails, much of that land shown in yellow — all of the land shown in yellow is wild lands now. It is open to people who would hike with packs or ride horseback and is closed to the use of mechanized travel and it is a place where man goes to visit, but doesn't build things to stay there. We are visitors, not residents of that type of place.

There are lands within the Park that are essentially wild and would qualify because they are roadless as wilderness, that we have not designated or have not asked for designation as official wilderness.

Let me briefly go through some of those: Area 1 -- this big stretch of country on the Mauna Loa Strip, on up the Summit Caldera of Mauna Loa, has access from the end of the strip road by the Mauna Loa Trail, by the Red Hill Cabin, on up to the Summit Crater -- there is another trail that goes down this way to the direction of the Mauna Loa Observatory. Also, there is a road that leads up there that is accessible by Jeep, that is

essentially a scientific road, used by the Geologic Survey, and there has been, for a number of years, a lock gate on it. This area designated for official wilderness status, is about 58,500 acres.

The character of the land is essentially open, barren lava that gets down into the upper edge of the ohia forest, the shrub lands, and down into dry shrub lands in the Mauna Loa Strip.

Area No. 2 is the big chunk of country that includes the Kau Desert. If you have been down in the Hilina Pali Road — the Hilina Pali Road makes a long finger into the wilderness; and the proposal is to leave the Hilina Pali Road as it is and exclude that salient from the wilderness area. The wilderness boundary would be the Park boundary, along the sea. This land has quite a few trails traversing it. It has some cabins that are available to the public — the Halape Ranger Station is heavily used by the public. It has a roof that collects water and the water is available for public use while it lasts. As most of you know, this country — all of this country within the Park, is without lakes and streams and so, water is hard to come by, when you get down into that country.

Area 3 is roughly from Puu ulu'ulu over to the Napau Crater, and it follows along the edge of the escape road that leads away from the volcanic area.

Area No. 4 is the big block of the Olaa Forest, that is essentially unimpaired rain forests, mostly tree fern and ohia

forest.

Our proposals are to have these 4 blocks officially designated as wilderness by Act of Congress. That would keep the present type of use within that land essentially the same, unless Congress later changed it.

We also have 2 red areas. They are within the authorized boundary of the Park. They are lands that we have never acquired. One is a block of rain forest land here that is 5,800 acres and if that were acquired by the Park, we would propose that it would become wilderness, as and when we got title to the property. Basically, it's unimpaired rain forest; it is habitat for rare plants and rare animals.

The piece down in here (indicating) is along the sea, bordered by the Great Crack, and abuts against our present property line. If this were acquired, we would propose that it would be included as wilderness.

We have not included a couple of sections that, because of their essential roadless character, would probably qualify as wilderness. One is this block of country here (indicating), that extends out into the Kau Desert from the Halemaumau Crater and Kilauea Caldera. The reason we have not is because this whole stretch of country is covered with an extensive network of instruments for geologic research — seismographs, tilt stations, and the character of these installations is that they require heavy batteries or heavy equipment regularly used and

used at -- you know, on very short notice. If the Mountain looks like it is going to erupt, scientists want to get out there and make quick measurements and so they do use 4-wheel drive to get in through this country. Type of measurements here going on in that area, are not only of great scientific value, but they give the Survey, the capability of predicting flows that could, in fact, affect the city of Hilo.

Another major chunk that we have chosen to leave out of wilderness, even though it is wild in character, is this land that is subject to the homesite provision of the Kalapana Extension Act.

It's possible that this could be left out of wilderness as an alternative, because it is a Jeep road. We proposed to put it in as wilderness, but have its use foreclosed, except for the Geologic Survey in its volcanic studies.

Is there a glass of water there, John?
HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Yes.

MR. HARRY: Thank you. We have asked for 3 exceptions to wilderness -- 1, we would like the volcanic research to be able to continue and we have asked for legislative approval to do this. We have asked for legislative approval to allow continued control of feral animals within the wilderness and we have asked for the provision to have public trail shelters that would collect water for visitor use within the proposed wilderness areas, at locations along the coast and locations at the summit of

Mauna Loa.

. 11

I think I will stop there, unless you have questions.
(No response)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Thank you, Superintendent Harry. Is there anyone present who wants to make a statement who did not give advance notice? If so, please give your name to the National Park Service Representative sitting at the table by the doorway; and we will take a short recess to permit that to be done.

(Short recess)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Well, apparently, everyone who wishes to make a statement for the official record has registered their intention to do so by now, so we will continue our hearing.

We have heard an explanation of the proposal by a representative of the National Park Service. Now, insofar as possible, we will adhere to the following order in calling for the presentation of oral statements. First, we will hear from the Governor or his representatives; second, from members of Congress; third, from members of the State Legislature; fourth, from official representatives of the County; fifth, from officials of other Federal Agencies or bodies; sixth, from organizations, in alphabetical order; seventh, from individuals, in alphabetical order; and eighth, from others not giving advance notice, to the extent there is remaining time — and it looks

like there will be ample remaining time, so we need not worry about that.

I am not aware that the Governor is present today, but I should ask -- is there anyone present who represents the Governor of the State of Hawaii?

(No response)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Is there anyone -- I am sure there is not a representative of the United States Congress present today, or is there anyone here that has been designated to speak for a member of Congress?

(No response)

Stated that time limitations may make it necessary to limit the length of oral presentations; also, that it might be necessary to restrict to one person, the presentation made on behalf of an organization. In view of the limited number of persons who have indicated a desire to make a statement, I will forego placing the usual time limitations on presentations. However, some of you may wish to summarize your prepared statement orally and file a more complete written statement at the same time for the hearing record. If, at the time of the presentation of your statement, you feel that your views have already been expressed adequately by others, you may wish to simply endorse the previous statement or statements and file your own statement and supporting materials for the record.

If anyone has a time problem and will speak to me about it, I will try to do what I can to hear you either earlier or later, as the case may be. Does anyone have a time problem here? (No response) HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: We will now move to the third cate+ gory. Are there any members of the Hawaii State Legislature present? (No response) HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Apparently not. We move to the fourth category. Is there an official representative from Hawaii County present that would like to be heard? 11 (No response) HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Well, we will go on to the fifth category, which includes officials of other Federal Agencies or bodies, and I will first call upon Major James J. Dorsey, 15 Department of the Army. Major Dorsey is Commander of the 16 Kilauea Military Camp. Major Dorsey? 17 I really don't want any speaking time. MAJOR DORSEY: 18 HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: We have lots of it, so help your-19 20 self. (Laughter) 21 TESTIMONY OF MAJOR JAMES J. DORSEY 22 In general, as I said yesterday -- our MAJOR DORSEY: 23 general position of the U.S. Army Support Command, Hawaii, is 24 one of support for the program as proposed and I have really no 25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

other comment -- no alternative proposed for this wilderness thing, which affects us, and so I don't -- our general position is one of support. That's about it.

Thank you, sir.

(Witness excused)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Thank you, Major Dorsey. Mr. Barry
Bodhaine, Mauna Loa Observatory. Mr. Bodhaine, is that correct?

MR. BODHAINE: Right.

TESTIMONY OF MR. BARRY BODHAINE

MR. BODHAINE: Well, I am representing Mauna Loa Observatory. I have been asked by Dr. Ronald Fegley, the Director of Mauna Loa Observatory, to make this statement; and this statement was prepared by Mr. Don Pack, who is the Director of the Geophysical Monitoring for Climatic Change. He is in charge of the entire global program for monitoring stations of the type of Mauna Loa Observatory. So what I will do is go ahead and just read the statement as Mr. Pack prepared it.

The following comments are directed to the Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's interests and needs for weather and climate research and specifically at its program for global monitoring embodied in the Geophysical Monitoring for Climatic Change Program.

As preface and explanation for these comments, we should briefly describe the motivations, goals and needs for knowledge of the atmosphere's concentration of trace chemicals and conta-

For the first time, man's technological activities 1 minants. have reached a level where his airborne effluence can compete with nature, to change the concentration of trace materials. Some, if not all of these materials, can alter weather or climate through changes in solar radiative transfer processes, for example, carbon dioxide or aerosols, or through modification of cloud physics processes, such as additional condensation particles or gases. Since weather and climate is intrinsically highly variable, it is necessary to know the concentration of the important species of trace materials and to document the changes with time, if their influence is to be quantified. Man 's actual habitations occupy only a very small fraction of the Thus, it is the average background or clean earth's surface. air values that will play the predominant role on a global basis. To obtain the required measurements, it becomes necessary

to sample in clean atmospheres, as little perturbed as possible by man's activities. It is also necessary to choose locations where this undisturbed environment is expected to remain essentially unaltered for many years. A general criterion is the expectation of 30 to 50 years without significant intrusion. NOAA -- that is, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration -- now has an operation of observatories established under these guidelines at Mauna Loa, Point Barrel, Alaska, Tutuila, American Samoa, and the South Pole, Antarctica. These locations provide measurements in representative latitude bands

10

12

13

15

19

20

21

22

23

24

and were selected after consultation with scientists of other countries, who are establishing similar programs, but in complementary locations -- for example, Australia or Tasmania. Of these locations, Mauna Loa is the first, oldest and still the only fully comprehensive program. This location, at 11,200 feet, is protected by the temperature inversion, from the upward transport of technological effluents from the Hawaiian Islands.

The wind patterns at this height, transit the entire Pacific without significant pollution input. In addition, the bare lava reduces interference from biota, and the absence of public roads and the rugged nature of the footing, minimizes the presence of man and his works, which could destroy the unique character of this site.

Further, the existence of monitoring data, extending back 18 years, represents a unique and invaluable global resource, since it is the only such record in the world.

Measurement requirements are for maximum sensitivity to detect the clean air background levels. Equipment is operated which can detect a single automobile passing several miles away. Carbon monoxide levels at Mauna Loa are about 1,000 times lower than in the cities. Small particles are found to number only 50 to 200 per cubic centimeter in this background air, compared to more than 500,000 in the cities.

With this as background, our comments follow: Now, in general, it appears that the acquisition of additional land,

and the designation of the land surrounding the Mauna Loa Observatory as Class 5, "Primitive or back country", can only enhance the preservation and longevity of the unique air environment at Mauna Loa. The specification in Unit 1, that is, Unit 1 on this map -- of 58,500 acres, including the upper reaches and summit area of Mauna Loa as wilderness, is endorsed. We request that the scientific needs of NOAA's Mauna Loa Observatory, be specifically recognized under the special provisions of the preliminary Wilderness Proposals, as a program of parallel importance to those of the Geological Survey. Such recognition could also appear in the preliminary study in the section, "The Parks and Its Resources", as a consequence of the unique air environment on Mauna Loa above the temperature inversion.

It should also appear in the Master Plan -- and he refers to a page number as either on Page 53 or under the "back country zone designation", in the Master Plan. We suggest the inclusion of this statement -- "The operation of NOAA's Mauna Loa Observatory constitutes a unique utilization of the special environment of the upper reaches of Mauna Loa. This site, consisting of no less than 4.05 acres of land, at the 11,150-foot elevation, together with the connecting utility facilities, a non-public road, electric power lines and communication lines, is considered part of the area's resources and preservation of its clean air qualities will be emphasized."

Now, I have several other specific comments pertaining to

2

: || :

3

-

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

the individual plans. Would you like me to go ahead and read all of these?

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Yes, go ahead.

MR. BODHAINE: Okay. In the Master Plan -- this document (indicating) -- on Page 57, the Plan indicates that "an additional trail connection will be made to the summit of Mauna Loa and the shelters thereon". Since the nighttime downslope air flow to the Observatory represents the cleanest of all air masses, the operation of petroleum fuel stoves or heating devices, would create significant interferences. Now, at this point -- the point is, that if we have people staying up here, operating stoves, the downslope air flow during the night falls this way, down the slopes, and bring exhaust from these small stoves right to our instruments (indicating).

It is suggested that the use of any petroleum fuel device is prohibited at the back country shelters. If such devices must be operated to prevent injury from cold, then the Observatory should be notified of the hours of operation.

Also, in the Master Plan, on Page 55, the wilderness threshold zone, reference is made to the inclusion of low standard roads; and later, that these roads will be located predominately at the coast or at lower elevations.

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: This is more of a Master Plan subject. Do any of these others refer more to the Wilderness Proposal? In other words, I think that most of what you are dis-

cussing there is the Master Plan, isn't it?

MR. BODHAINE: Yes. Okay. Now, I have several with the Wilderness Study, too, though. Okay. Well, anyway, we suggest that the roads be located exclusively along the coast and at elevations below 6,500 feet mean sea level.

Now, pertaining to the Wilderness Study, the use of Red
Hill and Mauna Loa Summit cabins -- and I have already commented
about the use of petroleum fuels above the Observatory.

Okay -- vehicular access to the upper slopes, specifically the summit of Mauna Loa for research activity is recommended. We agree with the plan, since this is essential to NOAA's Observatory. However, we suggest that administrative and/or physical measures controlling the road access, and which are acceptable to the residents of Hawaii, be designed. Once again, this would assist in preventing man-made pollution from destroying the Observatory's function.

Now, the rest of this applies to the Master Plan, so I will finish up with a few of my own additional comments: The Master Plan Environmental Statement, which is yellow, includes several alternatives which are identified "A" through "M". Now Mr. Harry didn't mention proposals which include the summit of Mauna Loa and a strip of land connecting with the summit of Hualalai. However, these were included in the yellow Master Plan, so I will comment on them.

We wish to endorse Alternative C, and suggest that its

boundary near Mauna Loa Observatory be moved a few miles north, to the 85-foot contour, to include Mauna Loa Observatory and 2 give a buffer zone. The communications facilities at the 83-3 foot elevation, would be excluded. 4 Alternative B, with its parkway, connecting Mauna Loa and 5 Hualalai, is totally unacceptable. We cannot allow automobile 6 7 traffic at the 10,000-foot level on Mauna Loa. Finally, the general plan of a wilderness area to encompass 8 Mauna Loa, is entirely compatible with the activities at Mauna 9 Loa Observatory, subject to the above restrictions; and we sin-10 cerely recommend that such a wilderness area be established. 11 12 Thank you. (Witness excused) 13 HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Barry Bodhaine. 14 Mr. Alika Cooper, representing the Congress of Hawaiian People? 15 MRS. COOPER: It's Alma Cooper. 16 HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Pardon? 17 It's Alma Cooper. 18 MRS. COOPER: HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Well, I have your card, which I 19 will call for in just a minute, after I complete this. 20 reads "Mr. Alika Cooper", if you don't mind. 21 Oh, I see. He is not here. MRS. COOPER: 22 HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: He is not here? 23 No, he isn't. MRS. COOPER: 24 HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Okay. That completes the sixth

category. We now move into the seventh category -- no, we don't, either. We still have a representative of the Conservation Council for Hawaii, the East Hawaii Chapter, Mrs. Helen S. Baldwin.

Mrs. Baldwin?

TESTIMONY OF MRS. HELEN S. BALDWIN

MRS. BALDWIN: This is a statement of the Flora and Fauna Committee of the East Hawaii Chapter of the Conservation Council for Hawaii on the Proposed Wilderness Plan for Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

The main proposal of the Wilderness Study Plan of August, 1973 for Hawaii Volcanoes National Park has the general support of the Flora and Fauna Committee of the East Hawaii Chapter of the Conservation Council for Hawaii. We would like to make the following comments and suggestions:

In Alternative B -- which you will see in your booklet there -- would its adoption further safeguard the area immediately south of Kilauea Crater from possible use for the development of geothermal energy? Other than this, we see no reason for including this in the wilderness area.

Could Alternative C be redrawn to permit Hawaiian homesites near the Kalapana end of the Extension Area? This end will abut on the boundary, the far side of which will likely be used for subdivision purposes, outside of the Park.

Does Alternative C include the recently acquired ranch area? It is not wilderness country and plans have been dis-

cussed about making this a maintenance study and research center, using the existing buildings.

We oppose Alternative D as it prohibits the rebuilding of the popular Chain of Craters Road now overrun with new lava flows and greatly limits the access to recreational areas previously enjoyed by people who cannot take long hikes.

We oppose Alternative E as there are many shoreside roads, trails, parks and other areas already in existence or planned outside of the Park for this kind of intensive outdoor use.

It is essential for the preservation of strand and marine shorelife, that as much of the coastal and tide zone area as possible be given wilderness protection.

We are in favor of Alternative F, providing the Jeep road corridor is closed to the public, but open to Park personnel and research scientists and their guests on occasion. At this high altitude, it is both inhumane and foolish to require persons who have to work there, to travel and carry everything on foot.

We oppose Alternative G for we can see no valid reason for closing the popular Hilina Pali Road and lookout to the public. It is necessary also for fire protection and Park maintenance use. It can be closed in case of fire hazard or volcanic activity.

In conclusion, we favor the original plan -- this one (indicating) -- plus Alternative F, with the proviso stated

above; or this, plus a redrawn Alternative C, leaving some land for possible Hawaiian settlement and some for future visitor use, such as roadways to new found volcanic outbreaks.

Respectfully submitted, Helen S. Baldwin, Chairman of the Flora and Fauna Committee of the Conservation Council.

Now, may I speak as an individual or should I do that later?

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: No, go ahead, as long as you are

already up here.

MRS. BALDWIN: As a Flora and Fauna Committee, we had to limit to flora and fauna. However, in the — this southwest section — Section 2 — in Section 2, why, there is a possibility of future outbreaks here, which people would like to see, in large numbers, and that would be inconsistent with the wilderness status; and so, personally, I would recommend that there be a clause allowing possible access roads, if future volcanic activities take place there. They are good for visitor use, so they can put in at least a temporary road so that people could come and see the activity, as they would in thousands; and that would not be wilderness, you see, so it would be a kind of temporary corridor, which could be closed afterwards — and if that could be included.

It would also be used, of course, by the Geologic people and by the Park personnel.

(Witness excused)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Thank you, Mrs. Helen Baldwin.

Mrs. Mae E. Mull of the Hawaii Audubon Society?
(No response)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Is Mrs. Mull present?
(No response)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Well, that completes the list of persons -- individuals who indicated their desire to make a statement prior to the Wilderness Hearing; and we will now go into the list of individuals -- representing organizations and speaking as individuals, who have registered during this hearing; and the first one I will call upon is Alma K. Cooper, Congress of Hawaiian People. Alma K. Cooper?

TESTIMONY OF ALMA K. COOPER

MRS. COOPER: As I was unable to be here yesterday, I would like to include in my remarks, the comments of the Congress of the Hawaiian People, in relation to the Master Plan and then, to include the Wilderness Hearing. Is that permissible?

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Well, I guess that will be all right.

MRS. COOPER: Thank you very much. I would like to preface this testimony by introducing myself. My name is Alma Kaiama Cooper. I am a native Hawaiian, a term defined in Section 3(b) of H.R. 1995, Public No. 680, June 20, 1938, as meaning: "Any descendant of not less than 1/2 part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778."

I am a member of the faculty of Hawaii Community College, but more important than that, my activities outside of my professional occupation, have been largely spent with the organizations whose purposes include the uplift and betterment of the Hawaiian -- native Hawaiians and other suppressed minority segments in this State. Today, this testimony is presented on behalf of the State organization of the Congress of the Hawaiian People.

In 1970, I was a very active member of the ad hoc committee that opposed the National Master Plan Proposal imposed by the Park Service upon this Island. The ad hoc committee waged its case against the Master Plan Proposal on the following issues:

- (1) The Proposal failed to adequately show due cause and justification for the need and purposes to extend the boundaries of the National Park on the Island of Hawaii to the governance and management system of the National Park Service, as administered from the office of the Park Service in Washington, D.C., was inappropriate and ineffective, in the unique environment of the State of Hawaii and the Island of Hawaii.
- (3) The rules and regulations of national policies that and exist/are implemented in the interest of conformity and order, in a nationwide system of supervision and management, imposed unreasonable restrictions and irrelevant standards upon the people of these Islands.
 - And (4): To certain significant measures, the interpretive

centers of the religious and cultural sites of the historical eras of the native Hawaiians, were planned, organized and presented in the pretext of research in the social sciences, general public information and interest, and this pretext has inflicted irreparable alterations and damages to specific monuments and sites, that have seriously impaired their integrity.

It is a known fact that the Master Plan Proposal was withdrawn. It is also fact that this public hearing is convened for
the purpose of receiving testimony on a "revised study and report",
entitled "Master Plan, Hawaii Volcanoes in the Draft Environmental Statement". It is appropriate, therefore, that I render my
assessment of the National Park Service on this Island in terms
of its governance and management performance prior to and since
1970, to objectively answer 2 basic questions, that are pertinent
for every individual to understand before he or she knows how
to respond to this Master Plan before us.

The questions are: "What is the performance record of management of the National Park System over the more than 220,000 acres of land currently under its jurisdiction?" And, "What do these records show is the nature and extent of the integrity, credibility and accountability of the Park Service?"

A fair and objective way to begin this assessment is to ask: "How has the Park Service upheld the legislative Acts of the United States Congress that relate to the management of lands within their jurisdiction?" To answer this question,

let me cite Section 3(a) and Section 3(b) of the Congressional Act of June 20, 1938.

This Act, specifically stipulates, in Section 1 that "the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease, under such rules and regulations as he may deem proper, land ascertained by him to be suitable for house sites purposes in the Kalapana Extension as described herein, to native Hawaiians, when such occupancy does not encroach on or prevent free access to any points of historic, scientific or scenic interest; or in any manner, obstruct or interfere with protection and preservation of said area, as part of Hawaii National Park; provided, however, that occupants of homesites shall reside on the land not less than 6 months in any one year; and provided further, that fishing shall be permitted in said area only by native Hawaiian residents of said area, or adjacent villages and by visitors under their guidance". Section B describes the meaning of the "native Hawaiian".

The questions that are frequently asked are: "Why was this Section 3(a)(b) of H.R. 1995, enacted, and what has the National Park Service done since the inception of this law and the Kalapana Extension Act of 1938 -- a period of 38 years?

Let me answer the first question:

The Kalapana Extension Act of 1938, extended the boundaries of the then existing Park, to include an additional 49 and more acres of land. The lands that were condemned by the Territory

for direct transference to the Federal Government, included Government lands of 12,190 acres, included lands that belonged to the late Territorial Senator, William H. Hill and included some 24,000 and more acres of land that belonged largely to native Hawaiian people. The price that was paid the native Hawaiian was as much as 30 cents an acre to 60 cents an acre, for their land in 1938. The last lands that were condemned in 1950, were purchased for prices ranging up to \$16 per acre.

We know that today, the adjoining lands sell for better than \$1.00 per square foot on the ocean front. This is the reason why these lands were condemned for purchase.

Section 3(a) and (b), which then provided for the homesites rights, I believe were enacted in moral and ethical conscience and as a compensatory measure to the indefensible Hawaiians, who clearly did not receive the protection and guarantees of their civil liberties, for they were forced to accept the condemnation of their lands at prices below a fair and equitable value. On the other hand, the late Territorial Senator, William H. Hill, who was obviously properly advised, was able to transact land exchanges that protected his interests.

Then the next question that is asked, logically, is, "What has the National Park Service done since the inception of this law and the Kalapana Extension Act of 1938, a long period of 38 years?" And perhaps to answer this, it's necessary to relay the events that will show up what the intentions were, until

public response built in certain kinds of control. The native Hawaiian, I believe, learned for the first time of this provision in the Kalapana Extension Act when the National Park Service came to this Island in 1970, with its original Master Plan. At that time, a Mr. Joseph Nakea and his daughter, Tanya Nakea, sent letters of applications for homesites to the Superintendent of the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park and to the Secretary of Interior. In both instances, the Park Representatives admitted they knew of no existing procedure by which to process the applications, and the applications were filed away; and that ended that incident.

Being interested personally about what would occur, I filed an application for homesite on April 20th, 1973; and I received a letter from Joseph Romberg who referred my communication to the Regional Office.

On April 26, 1973, I received a letter from Mr. John E. Cook, Acting Director, Western Region, National Park Services, who wrote that as the creation of homesites would, in effect, infringe or interfere upon the lands in the National Park, and because homesites was not a conforming use of National Park purposes, he said that they cannot — and I will quote this — "For the above reasons, we cannot recommend acceptance of your application".

Much distress that the National Park Service was going to again - deny the native Hawaiian of his civil liberties, I

sought legal counsel; and it was only upon the communication by my lawyer to National Park officials here, that we received then, a letter from Mr. Robert Barrel, who stated that the provision would be made available as soon as a study was completed, and that this study would be completed some time in the summer.

The point I want to make here is that it is unfortunate that laws created to guide the policies and management of the National Park System, sometimes themselves are not implemented and they will not be implemented unless there are people who will bird dog the National Park Management System and almost force them into doing what the law states must be done.

The chronological events as I have presented, pertaining to the law and the provisions of the Kalapana Extension, I believe, gives just cause for any person to have serious and considerable doubts about the integrity, the credibility and accountability of the National Park System. A stirring thought that must be taken into consideration in any objective and impartial assessment of the proposal at hand is, if the National Park has demonstrated its lack of honor and its lack of legal responsibility to enforce a law that has been in effect since 1938, how can the people of Hawaii accept the Master Plan Proposals in good faith, in trust, and in confidence? For the National Park System has, indeed, shown its lack of credibility and its lack of accountability. The character reference of the National Park System in Hawaii is highly questionable, for any

Agency -- Government Agency, that fails to institute the procedures to implement a law, in standing for more than 30 years, can hardly be entrusted to be responsible to serve the real interests of the public.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As I read the proposed Master Plan, I began to recall particular experiences I have known. My grandmother would wisely warn us children to "beware of him who speaks smoothly, in broad generalities, for his promises are empty and misleading". I feel my grandmother must have known the National Park Service, and particularly, the authors of the proposed Master Plan.

But this last remark is an aside, and rather than dwell on personal judgments, let me continue to provide evidence that relate to the question, "How has the Park Service upheld the legislative Acts of the United States Congress, that relate to the management of lands within their jurisdiction?" An Act to add certain lands on the Island of Hawaii to the Hawaii Nationa Park and for other purposes, dated June 30, 1938, states: addition, any land adjacent or contiguous to the Hawaii National Park, is hereby extended, which, at the discretion of the Secretary of Interior, are necessary for the proper rounding out of the boundaries of the Park, provided that the United States shall not purchase, by appropriation of public monies, any land within the aforesaid area, but such lands shall be secured by the United States only by public and private donations." I cannot find evidence to show that this provision has been amended explicity states that "the United States shall not purchase by appropriation of public monies, any lands within the aforesaid area". And this law still exists as read. Therefore, the unpublicized news that leaked out from reliable sources, that first revealed that the National Park Service had purchased the approximately 6,324 acres of land, known as Ainahou Ranch, from the Bishop Estate, for approximately \$624,000; and \$150,000 to the Shipman Ranch was incomprehensible.

A statement on Page 46 of the Draft Environmental Statement describes this purchase in these terms: "The most recent land acquisition in 1972 were Ainahou Ranch, of about 6,324 acres, et cetera". This report intentionally glossed over the truth of this matter, which is that the land was purchased; and this purchase was transacted, despite the restrictions placed on land acquisition, as stipulated in the 1938 Act.

It is appropriate once more to suggest that the integrity of the National Park Service, as reflected by management and its responsibilities to the law, gives a citizen adequate cause to cast worried doubts upon a Master Plan Proposal that is loosely put together in general language, that says "we believe in motherhood" -- blah, blah, blah, blah -- and only fools would support a position to give more than 123,000 acres of land away on such empty, sterile, meaningless words, particularly since the record performance demonstrates real causes for doubting

their integrity, credibility and accountability.

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have difficulty understanding how the National Park Service, whose current gross Park acreage is more than 200,000 acres of land, can propose that its boundary be extended an additional 123,500 acres for the purposes "to conserve and protect the unique resources of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, for expanded public use and for continued volcanic research by the U.S. Geological Survey". I find it difficult to understand why additional lands are needed for "expanded public use and continued volcanic research by the U.S. Geological Survey", when the record shows that these purposes can be achieved within the current boundaries that include the gross acreage of more than 220,000 acres. The Master Plan and the Environmental Impact Statement do not list any reasonable justifications for the National Park Service to prepare legislation for the purpose -and purchase of these additional lands. The Draft Impact State ment makes a faint attempt to justify this proposal for the following purposes:

(1) To control exotic plants and animal species; to protect native populations; or, (4) "Expansion of opportunities for visitor use or of resources and for continued volcano research by the U.S. Geological Survey". An admittedly elementary question that I would like to ask, in reference to the stated purposes is, "What does the National Park System need -- why does the National Park System need approximately 124,000 acres

of new lands, to achieve these purposes?"

Much of the new acreage -- its ecological state, its flora and fauna and its characteristics, duplicate the characteristics that are found on existing lands already under National Park Status. I searched for the justifications within the proposals and could find none of substance. It is truly ludicrous to expect any citizen to place much merit upon the National Park's intent to "control exotic plant and animal species; to protect native population", when evidences in the fields and on site locations within the existing boundaries, show that the exotic plants are uncontrolled and the goat population is multiplying.

Why then does the Park System need approximately 124,000 acres of new land?

To expand opportunities for visitor use of resources is another stated purpose. I sincerely believe there are already thousands of acres within the existing boundaries, where campsites can be located, where trails can be maintained and where the public can be given wide options for greater recreational use.

I am reminded at this time about my childhood and my mother's words that I truly believe coincide with the National Park's proposal for additional lands. Whenever my mother prepared a meal that was especially appetizing to our eyes and stomach, we would urge her to pile the food onto our plates — "More, more", we'd say. We usually would be cautioned and

we'd not hesitate to insist otherwise. Well, Mama was always right, and we would never eat all of the food on our plate.

This is my analogy of the National Park Service's Proposal.

The Proposal asks for additional lands largely because the National Park Service wants "more and more"; and for those of you who are here today who represent that Government Agency, I would like to say that I don't believe that you have substantiated any real need for these additional acreages and you have not shown reasonable justifications for this addition and you have not used the language of accountability in your writing.

why pile more land upon the National Park Service's plate simply because they keep urging, "More, more"? Simply because they promise good dreams? Simply because we happen to be idealistic? Instead, let's take a realistic view of these proposals and ask, "What will the National Park Service be able to deliver? In what priority; and in accordance to what time schedule?" No final Master Plan and an Environmental Impact Statement should be ranked as acceptable that does not define priorities and time table, because we, who live in Hawaii, want the National Park Service to be held accountable for all the promises they make.

Another stated purpose is for continued volcanic research by the U.S. Geological Survey. I would like to point to a previous procedure used by the National Park Service to the project titled "An Investigation of the Hydrothermal Systems at Kilauea

Volcano, Hawaii" -- the hydrothermal system which drilled on the sacred, religious grounds of the ancestors of the native Hawaiians. The decision to permit this adverse introduction of the unsightly drilling machinery on location, in an area of religious sanctity, was made by the National Park Service in conjunction with the National Science Foundation, the Department of Interior, Union Oil and quite possibly other representatives I will always remember that Saturday from large industries. afternoon when I looked at the monstrous drilling rig that burlesqued my ancestral past and in my mind, I knew then that I was looking at a monument that truly depicted the arrogant ugly American. And to add injury to malicious insult, the accumulated data, which will come from this experimentation, will be used to benefit big oil companies in their exploration for geothermal energy on the Mainland. The Congress of the Hawaiian People oppose the intrusion of foreign and adverse introduction into the sacred region of Pele, and Park representatives, officials of the United States Government, met this opposition by shrugging their shoulders, denied their responsibility and forced their commercial values in the name of science, in an area of religious sanctity. And some day, those of you who were responsible for that decision, will have to pay for that intrusion. The authors of the Draft Environmental Impact Study imply

> BILL'S RECORDING SERVICE PORTLAND, OREGON - HONOLULU, HAWAII

on Page 4, "Research and Resource Management", that the National

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Park Service intends to carry out this masquerade; and it can only be a masquerade that admits the destruction of the integrity of a religious region, on the one hand, and then composes a statement in the E.I.S. that reads that research will be conducted to "study the region of Pele and religious ceremonies connected with Kilauea". Only in a masquerade can such a condescending gesture be conceived.

It is a fact that Halemaumau is a religious region and simple logic would conclude that this area would be listed in the National Registry of Historical Places. This has not been done, despite the fact that Halemaumau was placed within the National Park Status in 1916 or thereabouts, more than 55 years ago. Again, I ask in earnest, "What has the National Park Service shown is its capability and capacity to manage with integrity, the more than 220,000 acres of land already within its jurisdiction?" I hope I have conveyed my points clearly and convincingly to allow a person to answer this question for himself; and I will continue to speak openly about the lack of integrity of the National Park Service and their ugly American monuments.

The Congress of the Hawaiian People will not support any boundary extensions of the National Park on this Island until the following alternatives are set. A top priority and at a time table that will be clearly spelled out. I would hereby, like to request, on behalf of the Congress of Hawaiian People,

that this entire testimony be included in all final forms of
the Master Plan and the Environmental Impact Statement. We feel
it is important for all readers to know the content of this testimony, lest certain erroneous assumptions are drawn by the mere
listing of the organizations' names under the catch-all leading
title "Coordination in the Review of Environmental Statement".

The alternatives listed herein are presented as alternatives to
your proposal for additional lands; and we do not mean that one
alternative is preferred over the other. These are all alternatives that we strongly support in lieu of the extension of
National Park boundaries.

Alternative A -- Olaa Forest, approximately 9,600 acres, with title vested in the Federal Government, be set aside for inclusion in properties to be included in the compensation of lands, justly deservant by the native Hawaiian people, for damages invlicted upon the Monarchy and for the illegal transference of land to the United States by the revolutionary government, namely, the Provisional Government and the Republic of Hawaii.

The Olaa Forest, under the terms of the 1938 Extension

Act, is not adjacent and contiguous to the existing Park boundary and is separated by small parcels of private, intervening land. Also, as the Olaa Forest is a tract that duplicates large acreages of other lands with hapu'u and the like, there is no need for the inclusion of this land into the existing

boundaries. To repeat, Olaa Forest shall be set aside as a tract to be included in the Reparations Act for the native Hawaiians.

2

3

5

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Alternative B -- The National Park Service has shown its gross inadequacies in managing the religious, cultural and historical places within the status of Park management systems. The evidence for this is included in the attached report entitled "Reaction of the Congress of the Hawaiian People to the National Park System on the Island of Hawaii". Because the findings show that the integrity of the religious, cultural and historical places had been adversely affected by the Park management system, Alternative B is proposed. In keeping with the principles of civil liberties and the ideals of self-determination, Alternative B proposes that all of the lands currently within the jurisdiction of the National Park System, that are of religious, cultural and historical significance, shall be deleted from National Park status and placed in the protection of the native Hawaiian people. These lands are to be a part of the total land parcel to be returned to the native Hawaiian people in the Reparations Act.

The acreages of these areas shall also include those surrounding lands that will serve as the buffer zones to protect the integrity of these historical lands.

In addition, the National Park Service shall correct all of the adverse introductions that have been made in these areas.

that have altered the sites and have adversely affected the integrity of the sites at their expense.

Alternative C -- Ainahou Ranch, a parcel of 6,324 acres, that includes residences, barns, corrals and water shortage facilities, was illegally purchased from Bishop Estate for approximately 100 and a few extra dollars per acre. The area is not a natural sanctuary for the nene, and so the reason for the illegal purchase is also illegitimate. This land transaction is illegal; therefore, the land must be returned to Bishop Estate, who then should offer the land to native Hawaiians for the price received in the illegal transaction with the National Park Service; and the Shipman Ranch should also receive the \$150,000 it received from the National Park Service.

Alternative D -- The National Park Service shall undertake a study to determine what was the fair value evaluation of lands, approximately 24,000 acres, that were acquired through condemnation with purchase in the Kalapana Extension Act of 1938.

The purpose of this study, which should commence immediately, shall be to correct those inequities that caused property owners to receive 30 cents an acre or 50 cents an acre for their lands. It is clear that the property owners were denied the protection of due process of law and denied their civil liberties. If legislation is necessary to remediate the gross unfairness rendered in this condemnation of lands, that was undertaken for the sole purpose of extending the boundaries of the Park, as

stated in the Kalapana Extension Act of 1938, the Department of Interior is morally and ethically obligated to initiate the process that will bring about immediate remediation to all of these property owners.

Alternative F -- Should any lands be transacted and purchased from the Bishop Estate for inclusion in the National Park System at any time, the Estate should forever retain the geothermal rights, for all of the profits that may be forthcoming in the future from these volcanic zones, will go to the education of the Hawaiian children.

Alternative G -- The homesites as stipulated in the Kalapana Extension Act of 1938, shall be placed within the boundaries of the Ahupuaha, the Kamoamoa , Laeapuki and Panau. These
Ahupuaha, shall be excluded from the Park and be included in the
Reparations Act. The cost to develop the house sites, the communities and the requirements of roads, electricity and water,
et cetera, shall be the responsibility of the National Park
Service.

And Alternative H -- When these long, unattended obligations are met by the National Park System, the stage for a Master Plan to extend Park boundaries may then be set. Therefore, the last alternative is for the extension of lands for the National Parks shall become acceptable sometime in the future, after the previously mentioned alternatives are met; and the Congress of the Hawaiian People, in response to the Wilderness

Study, will support Alternative A, no wilderness designation, for the reasons stated within that Alternative.

I thank you very much for allowing me this opportunity.

(Witness excused)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Thank you, Mrs. Alma K. Cooper.

Mr. Willis H. Hight, representing Human Animal & Plant Family.

Mr. Hight?

MR. HIGHT: I would like to pass. I want to listen some more.

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Okay. Mr. Quentin Tomich, Wildlife Society, Hawaii Chapter. Mr. Tomich?

TESTIMONY OF MR. P. QUENTIN TOMICH

MR. TOMICH: The Hawaii Chapter of the Wildlife Society is a local representative of the National Organization of Professional Biologists, who are concerned in one way or another with biological phenomena in management of wildlife resources.

In December, 1971, the Chapter adopted a position statement on the Feral Goat in Hawaii, with particular reference to problems in the National Parks. I would like to enter this position statement in the record, rather than to read it, but to refer to one point under the position of the Chapter, which is Point 2 in the control of goats, to include fencing of critical boundaries in internal management units to create barriers to free movement of goats within and into the Park. I bring this up in relation to the Wilderness Proposal, because it is indi-

cated in the Environmental Impact Statement that there is an adverse impact of these cross fences, which are proposed. The logic of our position here, in asking or recommending that this kind of fencing be done within what will now be possibly a wilderness area, is that it is the most feasible means of controlling the goats. No other means is workable without the assistance of a fencing program.

So I will conclude that statement. I signed, I believe, Mr. Davis, for another.

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Yes, that's all right. Go right ahead.

MR. TOMICH: So this is a commentary. My name now again is Quentin Tomich, and I am at this time, speaking as a member of the Wilderness Society. Now, the Wilderness Society is a national organization, which does not have local chapters. It is an organization which promotes the adoption, the development of legislation, which will provide for wilderness areas throughout the United States, among other things.

It is an organization which very closely studies problems.

It recommends areas; it promotes the adoption or the acquisition of areas.

In relation to the Wilderness Proposal, I call attention to special provisions on Page 10, of the Wilderness Study, in which 4 special provisions are recommended in legislation, designating wilderness within Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. This

may seem to be a minor point. These 4 special provisions are well developed here, including, for example, water collection systems within wilderness areas, instrumentation and the use of helicopters for volcano studies; the vehicular access road to the summit of Mauna Loa; and fences, tools and equipment necessary to accomplish feral animal control within wilderness areas. The point is, that I would like to make, that the Wilderness Society, through their legal advisors, have said that special legislative language is not needed to accommodate these activities or facilities. So, this is perhaps rather an esoteric point, but as a member of the Wilderness Society, I felt impelled to enter it into the record. I would like to leave that, and a copy of the position statement of the Wildlife Society, Hawaii Chapter.

That concludes my presentation. Thank you.

(Witness excused)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: That completes the last category, which include those who did not give advance notice of their desire to make a statement for the official record.

I have several letters as well as written statements pertaining to Wilderness Proposals for the establishment of wilder ness in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. These will be included in the official record.

I want to repeat, that anyone desiring a copy of the transcript should make arrangements with the Reporter to obtain it.

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mr. Chun will be able to advise you what the cost will be for this service. It will be available in approximately 10 days.

The Public Notice stated that this hearing would be held between 1 p.m. and 5 p.m. We will therefore take a recess for a half hour or so, to give those arriving later, an opportunity to make a statement for the record.

So, we will now go into recess and we will continue to open the hearing and go into recess until the 5 o'clock period has been reached. Those of you who wish to stay are welcome; otherwise, you may do as you wish.

(Whereupon, at 2:35 o'clock p.m., a recess was taken until 3:20 o'clock p.m., at which time the hearing reconvened.)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: I will call upon a Mr. Jim Peder-sen, who wishes to make a statement for the official record.

Mr. Pedersen?

TESTIMONY OF MR. JAMES PEDERSEN

MR. PEDERSEN: My comments will be very, very brief.

I am a resident of Volcano. I live on Haunani Road, about 300 feet from the Mauna Loa side, Okamura Store. What my concern is, is the secondary impact of the Unit 4. My concern is for an action which is currently going on, even without the proposed expansion, and that is of tour buses which currently come through the Volcano community. Now, what they do is come up Volcano Highway, proceeding to the National Park area and they will hang a right on Wright Road, and proceed mauka, and

with the area, like Kam, Lihua or Kilauea Avenue, and then take a left again and then go down Haunani Road back to get on Volcano Highway; and for those of us who live in the area, we don't really appreciate this. We have a beautiful area and we would like to keep it that way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, what I am concerned about, in terms of the interpretive center, is that we will again, of course, encourage more tourists and other local visitors from other Islands, who will come either by bus or by car, and increase the vehicular traffic within the old volcano residential area; and what this could snowball into is the widening of Haunani Road and possibly of Wright Road, and in the case of Haunani Road, this could mean the devastation of about 30 to 50 Sugi Pines and, of course, again, reducing the habitat for a number of birds which are common in this area, but not so much in other areas, like the apapane and the other species. And I have already talked to Ron Mortimore, and so he is already talking about perhaps providing a turn-around at the Interpretive Center, which I think would be a good idea and could provide the kind of alternative that we are looking for, so that bus drivers -- and I don't think they intentionally just drive around the area to make a lot of noise. I am sure they are just trying to make a nice trip for the traveler passing through the area; but if we provide a turn-around, it will eliminate him having to drive his bus through the area to get back onto the highway.

Thank you.

1

2

.3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Witness excused)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Jim Pedersen. Mr. Alfred Tong? Mr. Tong.

TESTIMONY OF MR. ALFRED TONG

Though I introduced myself last night, I would like to also say that I am a member of the National Parks & Conservation Association, as well as others, but I am just representing myself in addressing the Park Service people in regards to the proposed wilderness areas this time. general, I favor the proposed areas -- the 4 proposed areas and not favor any of the alternatives. That is, I favor this if the proposed wilderness areas will be managed as they are supposed to be, as other wilderness areas in the United States are and that is, a gradual phasing out of the uses that aren't suit able for wilderness areas, and perhaps one of these would be I don't think people who want to go into the wilderness areas want to be using -- well, the non-hunters want to be competing with the hunters in the use of the place, and in many wilderness areas that are managed by the Forest Service, well, multiple use concept is the way it's run and I don't think we want this in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, because I think there will be some conflict.

I would like to speak in representation, sort of in a way,

NOTABY PUBLI

of the many back-packers that are in growing numbers around the world and in the United States, too. I think probably, with their finding out that Hawaii has wilderness areas here, that they will be attracted to this place here and want to realize that while the back country over here is quite limited, and probably could withstand only a few back-packers, you know, not the many hundreds that go through the thousands and millions of acres that other wilderness areas have; but there are some restrictions over here. Probably, our back country and wilderness areas don't have the resources like the streams and meadows and shelters, lakes, water supply, and all that, that the others have. So perhaps, people coming here, with the idea that this is going to be similar to other wilderness areas, will be disappointed, and I think it should be made known so that perhaps we kind of discourage the use of the new wilderness areas for back-packing, except for -- well, sort of restricted use. don't think it's that suitable for the camping that is being done in many of the Mainland areas.

Also, there is another factor that our back country here and wilderness areas are probably going to be open all year around, whereas, on the Mainland, it is kind of restricted to the summer and winter uses, used just for cross-country snow skiing, and things like that. So, I would rather see the back country and wilderness areas being used more by local residents and preference being given to their use and not to hire outside

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the rights to bring people in and use the place. On the Mainland, well, some people do make a living out of bringing people into wilderness areas and bringing them out; and I don't want to see this thing exploited in Hawaii here by people who can afford to, say, form new companies, and I don't think there are people living on this Island that would start something like that. But if they should, I think it should be maybe done by the people who know it. I would rather see it regulated, run by the National Park Service. Again, they are limited in funds and manpower, I realize, and all this, but still, I would rather see it under the Park Service management than under C. Brewer, which has the concessions, as you know, to Volcano Houses and areas around there now; though I have nothing against C. Brewer.

Also, in other wilderness areas, back country use and wilderness area use is regulated so that the Forest Service or wardens -- Park Rangers or Superintendents, know who is in there; and I think this should be fully enforced over here so that they do know who is in here, so there should be a registration of all people going into the wilderness areas or for back country use and those who especially stay overnight. I think the Park Service should consider maybe a fee, too, for those who plan to stay longer or make use of the facilities. I don't think this is again rules. I think in Haleakala, use of the cabins does cost a little, or I may be mistaken. Maybe it is

free, but I don't think everything has to be free here in Hawaii, when other places, you do have to buy permits or buy some sort of sticker for going through the Park, or something like that. And I am not saying that you have to have a sticker to go through the Park, but to use the facilities in the back country or maybe in the wilderness areas, maybe there should be a fee, because then, this would restrict the number of people going in. When it's free, I think, well, we are encouraging anyone to go in there and what has happened in Haleakala, which I hope is not being done now, but a few years back, we had a kind of an increase in visitors, or, I think they are called "new people visitors" -- I don't want to say "hippies", though they are referred to them -- quite a few did kind of go into Haleakala and ruin it for the people who registered and went in there; and so we don't want to have this thing happen and maybe this phase or this fad will die out. Maybe we are not having so much of that now; but I think this is one reason maybe that we should have restrictions as to the use of the wilderness areas and back country use, by registration and maybe having I have been to National Parks on horseback and permits, fees. back-packing, and walking trips, so that I know that if the people who manage the Park know that there are too many people In fact, even in certain areas, they won't allow you to go in. when the hotels are filled, I think they discourage people from going in, simply because they can't find a place -- won't be

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

able to find a place to stay. Well, if all the cabins are taken, say, in -- well, this does happen in Haleakala, well, they can't allow more people to go in there, because it has only a certain carrying capacity. Well, this may have to apply when the summit areas of Hualalai and Mauna Loa become filled with visitors, why, you don't want more people going in there and then also, I think the people going in to get away from civilization, say, and want to be there by themselves, don't want to meet a crowded number of people already over there trying to get in to use the cabins.

Also, I think in the use of these areas -- maybe it is being done now, but I just want to remind you of it. I thought before, in going up Mauna Loa, people had to sign a waiver of responsibility; and I think this should also be in effect for people going into the wilderness and back country areas, because I don't think the Park Service should be the one responsible to rescue these people who are going in at their own risk, and so I think probably maybe in the interpretation programs, it should be publicized that people going into this area -- in these areas, which, to me -- and I am a resident here, so I know some areas are more dangerous than those that are on the Mainland and many of the Mainland people coming here don't realize the dangers of going into hidden lava cracks, and things I think this should be like that, or getting lost in forests. pointed out so that people realize that if they do get lost or fall in a crack, that it isn't the Park Service responsibility

1

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to waste their time and money to get them out.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Also -- well, I agree that the road that goes up to Mauna Loa, I think, should be kept open, as mentioned for the Geological Survey use, and I think that the Park Service would occasionally need to use that, too, so though the road -- the roads in the wilderness areas isn't something that is supposed to be over there. I agree that probably this road should be kept open for access for Geological Survey and for the Park use.

The road in Unit 3 now, if it becomes wilderness area, according to the use or regulations, whatever it is, I suppose can't become a road then; so, I am in favor of this not rebuild ing the road on -- along where it used to be; and if it is a wilderness area, well, I don't think it can be anyhow. how, that hairpin turn was dangerous, and as you know, there was an accident over there, and I think too many people were going too fast down this road anyhow; so if the Park Service needs to connect Kalapana Extension with the Chain of Craters Road, I think the proposed road through the Ainahou Ranch and down would be just as well and it doesn't have to be a super highway, because I think, when we had that super highway, much of the wilderness aspect was lost and people don't really appreciate it, going by it 60 miles an hour. Perhaps the new road could just be for the use of the Park Service, it being so close to a wilderness area. In other wilderness areas I have been through, I haven't known where you can just walk from the road across the

wilderness threshold into a wilderness. Maybe it is because
Hawaii is so small that you have to just take a few steps and
you are in the wilderness, but this isn't really my concept of
wilderness, when your car is on the highway going by.

So, in general, I would say that -- speaking also for the conservation minded people on the Island, I think the preferential use should be given to the residents of the Island and -- or at least, we should be given the equal opportunity to go into these areas and do what we wish as well as anyone else; and I hope the Park Service won't now open up this wilderness area to the Sierra Clubs and all these other groups that want to go in there and say, "You have freedom to do what you wish", and restrict the local residents. However, all of these things will take a little time and I feel that first of all, the fences should be finished and put up before it is opened up to the public to go into these areas, and I am in favor of the fences proposed being finished in Unit 2 and Unit 1.

And hopefully also, before this ever gets into being, since the lands at Kauai Hai were turned over to the Park Service, and nothing has been done that I know of, so far. Well, a little -- maybe they have changed the rocks around. I hope that the Park Service will be able to get the funds they need to properly manage Puukohola Heiau and all these other areas -- if they are going to get Kaloko also -- I sure hope that they can get the funds and get these things going, as well

as -- though I know it doesn't cost as much for the wilderness areas, as well as developing the other areas that are going to be expanded; because we waited a long time for the Kalapana Extension Road, and we finally got it, and I think we are going to wait a long time for these plans to go into effect, but I think that if we will be patient enough, I just hope that after all this work of drafting these, planning these, and all that, that it will come to being and not be cut off because of the National Budget having other priorities, maybe in space, and other things.

So, this is about all. I hope that the National Park people on this Island will help all they can to see the Master Plan and the proposed wilderness areas plans go through to completion.

Thank you.

(Witness excused)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Alfred Tong. Before we go into another recess, I would like to ask if there is anyone present who would like to express his views as to the proposal to establish wilderness in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, before we discontinue our hearing for a short time. Is there anyone present who would like to make their views a matter of record?

(No response)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: If not, we will go on to another

1.

recess until someone shows up who wants to make a statement.

(Whereupon, at 3:40 o'clock p.m., a recess was taken until 5:00 o'clock p.m., at which time the hearing reconvened.)

who presented statements and related information, for the orderly manner in which they have been presented, and for the excellent cooperation all of you have given us during this hearing. Since it appears that all interested organizations and persons have been heard on matters with which this hearing was concerned this afternoon, I declare this hearing is in recess until 7 p.m. this evening.

(Whereupon, at 5:01 o'clock p.m., a recess was taken until 7:18 o'clock p.m., at which time the hearing reconvened.)

EVENING SESSION

2 3 HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Will you please take your seats?

4

This is a continuation of the hearing which we started at 1 o'clock this afternoon and I will now call on Mrs. Mae E.

5

Mull of the Hawaii Audubon Society. Mrs. Mull.

6

TESTIMONY OF MAE E. MULL

7

MRS. MULL:

The Hawaii Audubon Society has reviewed the Draft Environmental Statement and the Wilderness Study and gives

8

full support to the findings that "significant portions of the

9 10

volcanic features, rain forests and Pacific Ocean shoreline in

11

Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, on the Island of Hawaii, have

12

been found suitable for preservation as wilderness and are pro-

13

posed for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation Sys

14

15

tem".

The following comments and recommendations relate to manage-

16

ment of the wilderness areas and provisions of the Wilderness

17

Proposal to be submitted to the Congress: From our knowledge

18

of the areas involved and from study of the services, guidelines

19 20 for Wilderness Proposals, we conclude that all 4 of these spe-

21

cial provisions for management should be specifically written out in the legislation that designates wilderness status.

22

is necessary to include these provisions because of the singular

23

character of this Park's wilderness. Without these provisions

24

in the statute, Park management that is based on them, could be denied at a later time or simply not carried out.

25

BILL'S RECORDING SERVICE PORTLAND, OREGON - HONOLULU, HAWAII

These are comments on those 4 provisions: Number 1 -without the provision for unobtrusive catchment of rain water
on the coastal wilderness, even light visitor use would be unduly
restricted.

Number 2 -- the geological and volcanic research by the

U. S. Geological Survey is of such importance to Hawaii and the

Nation, that the minimum tools, instruments and vehicular access
in Unit 2, should be specially allowed.

While maintaining the Jeep road on the north side of Mauna Loa to the summit may be a necessary facility for weather observatory personnel, strong arguments for this exception are not presented. If such road use is allowed, there must be effective safeguards to insure that such travel is not abused. It must not become a route for recreation use by vehicles.

3 -- including provisions now for the later wilderness status of the 2 parcels to be acquired by the Park, will quicken the process, avoid duplication of labor, reduce costs and relieve the Park and public of unnecessary paperwork. The 5,800 acre tract in Unit 3, would be a particularly valuable wilderness addition, because of the dynamic natural forces at work there. With near continuous volcanic activity, causing rapid alteration of biotic communities, this is a unique area for long-term research in the processes of regeneration, natural selection, succession and genetic change in species, in a native forest ecosystem.

Ŧ

~

-

Number 4 -- the special provision for minimum tools and fences to stop feral animals from entering the Park wilderness, is absolutely essential to wilderness designation. If this provision is not written into the legislation, eventually, there could be no Hawaiian wilderness left to preserve in the Park.

The provision should not only permit fences within the wilderness areas, but must constrain the Park to maintain the fenced boundaries in perpetuity. The proposal to Congress should be so written that wilderness status and a special provision for tools and fences are inextricably tied together.

Since there are inevitable changes in Park policy and managers, the fencing provision should be a mandatory directive to the Park and not a discretionary action. The Park should not only have the authority to construct and maintain fences in this wilderness, but it must be directed to do so.

If wilderness status and boundary fencing are not tied together in one package; and if wilderness designation is granted alone, the consequences could be disastrous for the wilderness itself.

Future policy and funds could be directed to other projects, such as visitor facilities and road construction; and the fences neglected or construction halted. Volcanic eruptions could quickly alter and divert management programs and actions that are now aimed at restoration of endangered plant and animal communities. Considering such future possibilities as these,

the present emphasis on the enhancement of native Hawaiian ecosystems, through the control of exotic populations of plants and animals, could soon decline.

mammal control are vital to wilderness preservation. Without both programs, the present populations of goats and pigs could quickly double or triple in number. Without permanent boundary fencing the animals have continuous open entry to wilderness lands from adjacent non-Park lands. Since internal control of exotic animals is subject to the fluctuations of policies and managers, at least one control measure should be permanent and unchanging; that is the special provision in the wilderness legislation that directs the Park to construct and maintain boundary and exclosure fences for the preservation of wilderness values. With that mandatory provision in the wilderness legislation itself, there will also be a permanent basis for the necessary funds to maintain the fencing project.

It is assumed that other control programs will continue, such as goat drives and direct reduction of animals by Park personnel and deputized citizens. There is no mention of how goats, rounding up in drives, will be removed from wilderness areas, when 4-wheel vehicles will be excluded from those areas.

The Society appreciates the opportunity to review the Wilderness Proposal and we request that thoughtful consideration be given to the points raised here.

Submitted by Mae Mull, Island of Hawaii Representative of the Hawaii Audubon Society.

(Witness excused)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Thank you, Mrs. Mae E. Mull. Mr. William P. Mull. Mr. Mull.

TESTIMONY OF MR. WILLIAM P. MULL

MR. MULL: Thank you. My name is William Mull. I am a resident of Volcano. I spent virtually all my time on biological field work, in or near the Park; and I intend to continue doing this for the rest of my life.

I strongly support the Wilderness Proposal and I commend the present Park Administration, both for their perception of the fragility of native ecosystems within the Park and for their determination to protect these native plant and animal communities from foreign plant and animal invaders. Even so, I think the proposal as 2 significant weak spots on these points.

First, it understates the uniqueness and potential scientific value to mankind of these oceanic Island ecosystems and their remarkable plant and animal components. I think it important for Congress to have a more complete and explicit picture of the biological wonders that are being proposed here for Congressional protection.

Second, the special provision for feral animal control measures is cast in such a way that it might be interpreted solely as permission to undertake special control measures.

In

view of the necessity for vigorous, long-term pursuit of this and similar programs, if these native ecosystems are to survive, I think it essential that this most important of the 4 special provisions, be cast as a Congressional directive rather than as a Congressional permit.

In my view, the Wilderness Proposal will have a much better chance both for Congressional approval and for insured long-term effectiveness in achieving its purpose, if strengthened in these 2 ways.

I will resist the temptation to elaborate on these points at this hearing and simply offer to work with the Park Administration in any way I can to provide Congress a more definitive perspective on these 2 aspects of the Proposal for their deliberations.

Thank you.

(Witness excused)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. William P. Mull. Is there anyone else or anyone present who wishes to make a statement for the official record?

(No response)

HEARING OFFICER DAVIS: By way of explanation for the "official record", this is a continuation of the public hearing that was started at 1 p.m. This second part of the hearing started at 7 p.m. and it is now 7:30 p.m.; and since it appears that all interested organizations and persons have been heard,

BILL'S RECORDING SERVICE

CONVENTION REPORTING

COURT REPORTING

NOTARY PUBLIC

on matters with which this hearing was concerned, I declare the hearing closed. (Whereupon, at 7:30 o'clock p.m., the hearing in the above entitled matter was closed.)

> BILL'S RECORDING SERVICE PORTLAND, OREGON - HONOLULU, HAWAII

25

1 BEFORE THE 2 U. S. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 3 HILO, HAWAII 4 5 In the Matter of: 6 WILDERNESS PROPOSAL, 7 HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK 8 9 I, the undersigned Wm. Chun, hereby certify that I was 10 Official Reporter in the above-captioned proceedings; that these 11 proceedings were then and there recorded by me on the date as 12 set forth in captioned Page 1 hereof; that thereafter, these 13 proceedings were reduced by me and/or under my direction to 14 typewriting; that the foregoing transcript, Pages 1 to 62, both 15 inclusive, constitutes a full, true and accurate transcript of 16 said proceedings, so recorded by me, and of the whole thereof. 17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th 18 day of March, 1974. 19 WM. CHUN, 20 Official Reporter; P. O. Box 3854, Portland, Oregon 97208. 21 22 23

> BILL'S RECORDING SERVICE PORTLAND, OREGON - HONOLULU, HAWAII

NVENTION REPORTING COURT REPORTING